

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant : Yutaka IYOKI Group Art Unit: 2171  
Appln. No. : 10/057,937 Examiner: Ranodhi Serrao  
Filed : January 29, 2002 Confirmation No.: 3791  
For : NETWORK SCANNER AND FILE TRANSMITTING/RECEIVING SYSTEM,  
AND USER TERMINAL APPARATUS AND FILE  
TRANSMITTING/RECEIVING METHOD

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowability, mailed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 27, 2008 and to the Statement of Reasons for Allowance attached thereto, Applicants wish to clarify the record with respect to the basis for the patentability of claims in the present application. In this regard, while Applicants do not disagree with the Examiner's indication of allowability, Applicants submit that each of the claims in the present application recite a combination of features, and that the basis for patentability of each of these claims is based on the combination of features recited therein.

Moreover, Applicant notes comments made in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance and wishes to directly respond to these comments as follows:

The Examiner indicated that the scanner is hardware as recited in the specification in paragraph 26. In this regard, Applicant additionally notes the scanning function can clearly be performed by software. Moreover, any details of the scanner disclosed in either paragraph 26 or figures 1 and 2 are explicitly not incorporated into the claims of the present application.

Additionally, in paragraph 8 of the Examiner's Amendment/Comment, the Examiner appears to quote the last paragraph of claim 20 and 21. Thereafter, the Examiner correlates the recitations of the claims with paragraph 61 of the specification as well as with paragraphs 12, 13, and 70 of the specification on which the Examiner relied "for further explanation".

It is assumed in this regard that the Examiner's reliance on the above noted portions of the specification is merely as an explanation or as a possible (non-limiting) example of a feature of the invention and that the Examiner is not attempting to limit the claims with the particulars of the specification. In this regard, Applicant notes that while the claims are read in light of the specification, features from the specification are not to be read into the claims. Accordingly, it is assumed that the Examiner's comment is in accordance with this well-known principle and is not intended to limit the claims to the specific features disclosed in the cited paragraphs of the disclosure.

In particular, Applicant's invention is defined by the specific and particular terms recited in each claim. In this regard, applicant notes that the Examiner has correctly concluded that the limitations in the independent claims "are not specifically disclosed or remotely suggested in the prior art of record".

P21953.A03

Should the Examiner disagree with any of the above noted comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Yutaka IYOKI



Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz  
Reg. No. 33630

April 16, 2008  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191